

A564

tion of its Guantanamo Naval Base on Cuba). Khrushchev called them "just demands in keeping with the elementary rights of every sovereign state."

Khrushchev noted that Russia had withdrawn its rockets and bombers from Cuba. Now, he said, it was time for President Kennedy to guarantee noninvasion of the island.

Should U.S. pledges be broken, he said, it would have a far-reaching effect in destroying Soviet confidence in the word of the United States.

He said the main result of recent Soviet foreign policy was that an attack on Cuba prepared by aggressive militarist circles of the United States was averted.

World public opinion warmly greeted "the victory of the policy of commonsense."

He said Russian rockets were sent to Cuba only so that the United States could see "the real danger of thermonuclear war."

"We were sure that this would bring them to their senses," he said.

Khrushchev ridiculed contentions that Russia had chosen Cuba as a jump-off site for war against the United States and said this was "malicious fabrication."

"Had we wanted to start war against the United States we would not have agreed to dismantle the rockets installed in Cuba which were ready for launching for action. We would have brought them into play. We did not do that because we had no such aims," he said.

December 12, 1962:

President Kennedy indicated yesterday that there has been too much speculation about Adlai Stevenson's role in the Cuban crisis and pointedly declared that the matter should be left to historians.

At the same time, the President stressed that positions taken in the Cuban crisis frequently changed during the discussions as the National Security Council examined alternatives and the possible repercussions.

But, he added in a discussion of the matter at his press conference, the final judgment was always made by him as President.

December 13, 1962:

Under Secretary of State George W. Ball said today the world may be entering a period of "profound political change" in which both the hazards and possibilities of peace would be increased.

Ball said recent events in Cuba and other trends suggest that we may be passing from a period of rigidity in world politics into an era of great mobility and maneuver.

Ball said President Kennedy's quarantine of Cuba to be only the first move in a complicated strategy. But Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's decision to remove his missiles made the rest of the strategy unnecessary, Ball said.

December 13, 1962:

American firmness and flexibility in handling the Cuban crisis have transformed the spirit of the Western Alliance, members of the NATO Ministerial Council acknowledged to one another today.

German Foreign Minister Gerhard Schroeder aptly summed up the feelings of many others when he said that Cuba had shown that the United States was prepared to run the necessary risks to safeguard mutual interests.

As a result of the Cuban experience, Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the 15-nation NATO Council, there is a sense of anticipation among the Allies that the opportunity for new initiatives may be opening up.

Nevertheless, he said, it would be dangerous to think that the Cuban developments have made the situation in Berlin any more favorable. The Russians still reject any notion of continued Western presence in Berlin.

Actually the Cuban crisis is not yet over, Rusk pointed out. The United States is reasonably confident that all Soviet missiles and

IL-28 bombers have left Cuba, but cannot be entirely sure.

A non-American source said Rusk told the Council that 10,000 to 12,000 Soviet troops remain in Cuba in four distinct combat units. These are not instructors or a military assistance group but definite military units, the source said.

In addition, Rusk asserted, Russian surface-to-air missiles are still in Cuba, despite Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's indications that all would be removed.

Although the United States has no desire to invade Cuba, Rusk reiterated, it cannot be in the position of giving assurance above its treaty commitments in the Western Hemisphere or of sanctioning interference by the Castro government with neighboring countries.

December 15, 1962:

North Atlantic Alliance countries today wound up their 3-day fall ministerial meeting with a tribute to the American stand on Cuba and a concession to appeals for strengthening conventional military forces.

Soviet action in secretly stationing nuclear missiles in Cuba had brought the world to the verge of war, the final communique said, but the peril was averted by the firmness and restraint of the United States, supported by the alliance and other free nations.

December 15, 1962:

Red China, asserting unshakable belief in its brand of communism, issued a manifesto today accusing the Soviet bloc of attempting to split the Communist world.

And while chiding Moscow over its role in the Cuban episode, the 6,500-word Peking policy statement proposed a meeting of all the world's Communist parties to attempt to heal the Chinese-Soviet rupture.

The Chinese stand was published in the Peiping People's Daily, official organ of the Chinese Communist Party.

In backing down on Cuba, the Soviet Union was "scared out its wits" in the face of nuclear strength, Peiping said.

"We neither requested the introduction of nuclear weapons into Cuba, nor obstructed the withdrawal of 'offensive weapons' from that country," the People's Daily said. "For us, therefore, there is no question whatsoever of 'adventurism,' still less of 'plunging the whole world into a thermonuclear war.'"

The Merger Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the greatest threats to our free enterprise system is the tremendous merger movement which has affected practically every industry in the Nation.

The early development of this merger movement first came to my attention at the end of World War II. At that time I was a Member of the House of Representatives and served on the House Small Business Committee.

Those of us who worked to plug the gaping loophole in section 7 of the Clayton Act through passage of the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950, hoped that this legislation would hold the merger movement in check. Although the antitrust agencies have been given more effective statutes, the merger movement nonetheless has continued to gather force.

The sharp upward trend in the merger movement has been highlighted in a staff report recently issued under the direction of the able Congressman and my good friend, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. That report, entitled "Mergers and Superconcentration," reviews the merger movement in recent years since the passage of the Celler-Kefauver Act, and is required reading for anyone concerned with the monopoly problem.

The Washington World of December 7, 1962, published a debate between the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and Dr. Chares T. Stewart, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] contending that big mergers are snuffing out American small businessmen and Dr. Stewart taking the opposite position. Dr. Stewart is the director of economic research of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I have carefully studied the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN's] report on "Mergers and Superconcentration." This document is mentioned in the Washington World article, along with a report entitled "Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958," recently issued by the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which I am chairman.

Dr. Stewart's argument to the contrary notwithstanding, it is my opinion that these two documents are full of objective evidence of the dangers to small business posed by the merger movement. In any event, I am surprised to see the representative of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce taking the position that recent increases in concentration represent merely a shake-out of small business and a return to normal. Moreover, I am amazed that such a representative would take the cavalier position that many small firms which remain must make the invidious choice of merge or fill.

Dr. Stewart has no factual basis for intimating that mergers are motivated by technological factors. The fact is that most mergers are motivated by power and profit, and small business is the victim.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the Washington World previously referred to be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. SMALL BUSINESSMEN: ARE BIG MERGERS SNUFFING THEM OUT?

(NOTE.—Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, is chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, which recently released a study of business acquisitions of the Nation's 500 largest industrial firms and 50 largest merchandising companies. A Member of the House since 1928, he is chairman of the Joint Economic Committee and vice chairman of the Joint Defense Production Committee.)

YES

(By Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas)

America is at the crossroads. It must face up to the alternative paths lying ahead. Will it follow the road to monopoly and ever-increasing concentration of economic power? Or will it take the other alternative—the hard and rocky road to a restoration of competitive free enterprise, with the preser-

1963

Cuban crisis. Most of the U.S. ships participating in the blockade of Cuba return to their ports. The U.S. Defense Department orders the release from active duty of 14,200 Air Force reservists called to active duty during the Cuban crisis, cancels involuntary duty extensions of Navy and Marine Corps personnel, and ends the special alert of the Strategic Air Command.

November 24, 1962: Castro Government begins demobilization of militia units called to arms on October 22.

November 26, 1962: Cuban Government newspaper *Revolucion* reports that Cuba will permit UN investigators to verify the removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba if the United States will agree to U.N. supervision of the dismantling of "training camps of mercenaries, spies, saboteurs and terrorists" allegedly set up as anti-Castro bases on U.S. soil.

Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan leaves Cuba and returns to New York.

November 28, 1962: The Cuban situation was discussed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on a television program tonight. He warned that although negotiations here and in Washington had eased the Cuban crisis, Americans must not draw too many conclusions about a relaxation of world tensions.

"We were deeply gratified to see the immediate unification of the [Western] hemisphere with unanimity on the nature of this threat and the necessity that it be removed," Mr. Rusk said in reference to the Soviet introduction of missiles and other offensive weapons into Cuba and their subsequent withdrawal. "Had there been disunity and had we fallen to quarreling among ourselves, I think the results might have been quite different."

He said of the easing of the Cuban crisis: "I think it gives us all some confidence for the future."

However, he added: "I don't want to mislead you on that because we have cautioned our friends from drawing too many conclusions from the Cuban experience. The Soviet Union remains a great power. There were special circumstances in Cuba which are not necessarily present in other parts of the world."

November 29, 1962: President Kennedy and Anastas I. Mikoyan, a Soviet First Deputy Premier, met for 3 hours and 15 minutes today in an apparently inconclusive conference on Cuba and some other cold-war issues.

Both the White House and Mr. Mikoyan announced after the meeting that an agreement had been reached to continue at the United Nations the United States-Soviet negotiations on the Cuban situation.

November 30, 1962: A luncheon conference in Washington between Anastas I. Mikoyan and Secretary of State Rusk covered a wide range of issues. There was no sign of any change in Soviet and United States positions.

December 1, 1962: Anastas I. Mikoyan left Washington for Moscow, affirming the goodwill of the United States and pledging that the same "will be evinced by us." The Soviet leader expressed optimism on a settlement on Cuba and future Soviet-United States relations, but American officials were more reserved.

December 2, 1962: Secretary General Thant voiced hope that the "spirit of compromise" in United States-Soviet negotiations on Cuba would be extended to other outstanding problems. The United Nations leader cited Berlin as an issue on which compromise might be imperative and added that the West did not seem to grasp the full significance of "an obvious change" in the Soviet political mood.

December 3, 1962: Washington announced yesterday that Soviet jet bombers were being

shipped out of Cuba in line with Premier Khrushchev's pledge to President Kennedy. The Pentagon said patrol planes had spotted the Russian freighter *Okhotsk* sailing from Cuba with at least three dismantled *Nyu-shin-28's* on deck, while other jets were being crated at a Cuban airbase.

December 5, 1962: President Kennedy sought yesterday to end speculation that Adlai E. Stevenson would be replaced as U.S. representative to the United Nations. In a letter to Mr. Stevenson, the President expressed his "fullest confidence" in him and voiced deep regret over a controversial magazine article implying that Mr. Stevenson had advocated a "soft" line toward Moscow in the Cuban crisis. Mr. Stevenson termed the article "wrong in literally every detail."

December 5, 1962: The economic plight of Cuba was reflected in a Government decree nationalizing most shops dealing in clothing, shoes, and hardware. The move was regarded as a first step toward rationing. Many of the stores were painted with the word "nationalized"—and a hammer and sickle.

December 6, 1962:

U.S. Navy planes have verified that 42 Soviet jet bombers are being transported home from Cuba aboard 8 ships. Coincident with this Pentagon announcement yesterday was a report from anti-Castro sources in Havana that Soviet troops were apparently bolstering Cuba's defenses. The report, dated November 29, said that many Soviet troop units were building underground fortifications and airfields throughout the island.

December 7, 1962:

U.S. analysts expressed doubts today that Cuban negotiators would be able to obtain sufficient Soviet-bloc aid to overcome Cuba's worsening economic difficulties.

This view was held despite the contention by Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, head of the 16-man economic mission that flew to Moscow Wednesday, that in 1963 Cuban-Soviet trade would exceed this year's total.

U.S. specialists believe the Soviet bloc may lack both the capacity and the desire to raise again at this time the flow of aid and of subsidized trade that has been reaching Cuba in recent years.

December 8, 1962:

Nine thousand marines quit Caribbean.

A Marine brigade of about 9,000 men is on its way back to California after service in the Caribbean area during the Cuban crisis, the corps announced Friday.

This was the first official disclosure of the size of the Marine force sent to the Caribbean and to the Guantanamo Naval Base in late October, when the United States was building up its military power to cope with a missile threat from Cuba.

December 9, 1962:

Adlai E. Stevenson sought to draw the final curtain yesterday on the Adlai affair.

"There has been too much talk, I think, already, and much of it wholly uninformed," said the United Nations Ambassador of the furor created by a Saturday Evening Post article last week suggesting that Stevenson favored a softer policy on Cuba than President Kennedy adopted.

"The important thing," Stevenson said yesterday, "is that the Soviet Union has removed the nuclear weapons and the bombers from Cuba without us firing a shot or seriously risking world war and without cost to the United States."

"I think that President Kennedy's firmness and prudence have been richly rewarded, and I am proud to have had a part in the formulation of his policy and in its execution."

Stevenson continued: "The important thing, it seems to me now, is to conclude this transaction with the Soviet Union and to move on to further negotiations with them about the many other problems and conflicts

that embarrass our relations and the security of the world."

He said the United Nations throughout the Cuban affair, "performed in the classic manner in which it was intended to perform."

"It provided a forum for the parties to expose their grievances. It afforded a means of marshaling world opinion. And it provided an opportunity to the United Nations, to the Secretary General, to offer mediation and conciliation."

December 10, 1962:

The United States is about ready to close the book on the Cuban crisis and open the way for possible talks with the Soviet Union on other world issues, Secretary of State Dean Rusk made clear yesterday.

The one remaining obstacle, Rusk indicated at his first press conference in 5 months, is the continuing presence in Cuba of Soviet military forces. The Secretary recalled President Kennedy's statement that the Soviets had promised that at least some of these forces would be withdrawn. Rusk added:

"Certainly we in this hemisphere could not accept as a normal situation any Soviet military presence in Cuba."

Rusk said there are several thousand troops still in Cuba, adding that "the numbers are significant but not large. Their role there is something that is of great concern to us and something we will follow very carefully."

Rusk called the failure of the Soviet Union to provide in Cuba the verification of missile removal which Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev had promised the President "a very serious deficiency." But he made it evident the United States was not going to push any further on this. The United States intends to continue aerial reconnaissance over Cuba and is prepared to shoot back if any of its planes are shot at, it was learned elsewhere.

December 11, 1962:

Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev today rebuked Communist China for its criticism of Russian handling of the Cuban crisis in the most direct Russian comment so far on the ideological rift between the two countries.

In a 2-hour and 48-minute televised address to the final session to the Supreme Soviet (Parliament), Khrushchev said the "so-called Marxist-Leninists" who criticized his Cuba policies were trying to get the United States and Russia at each other's throats and provoke a world war.

He said those who call imperialism a "paper tiger" should remember that "the paper tiger has nuclear teeth."

It may still use them and should not be treated lightly. Therefore, in relations with imperialist countries, compromises are possible.

He said that if Russia listened to "ultra-revolutionary shouters" during the Cuban crisis the world would have been plunged into a thermonuclear war.

The Soviet leader said the time had come for ending the crisis through negotiations.

"In what way have we retreated?" he asked. "Socialist Cuba exists. Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The impact of her revolutionary example will grow. The Government of the United States has given a pledge not to invade Cuba. The threat of thermonuclear war has been averted. Is this a retreat?"

Khrushchev pledged himself to fulfill Soviet commitments in the Cuba settlement "so long as the other side stands by this understanding." Then he added:

"But if the commitments assumed are not observed by the other side, we shall be compelled to take such action as may be required by the situation."

Referring to Cuban Premier Fidel Castro's five demands (which include U.S. evacua-

Appendix

New Frontiers for the Old West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 6, 1963

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on December 13, 1962, the National Association of Counties held a grazing, water, and revenue conference in Las Vegas, Nev. This meeting brought together officials representing county units of government throughout the western region to discuss improved programs and policies for use of our natural resources.

The concluding banquet address at the conference was delivered by the Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture. He offered a proposed revolution for western counties. Through forward-looking proposals, Secretary Freeman suggested methods by which we could renew and revitalize development of rural areas. I ask consent that a portion of the text of Secretary Freeman's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY HON. ORVILLE FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

I want to challenge you to help rural America.

In the past 2 years we have made sound progress in bringing rural areas development from a vague concept to a specific and detailed program which can bring new economic opportunity to rural America. We have both recognized and taken vigorous action to meet the problem of underdeveloped areas in our own country. And I say underdeveloped advisedly, for there are many areas in our own country which lag far behind the rest of the Nation. These areas desperately need economic and technical assistance.

Now this administration has begun to develop ways to get our own underdeveloped areas moving ahead, as well as those in other nations. The actions we have taken should have been taken long ago.

Some of it has been administrative action which could have been taken any time the will to act was there. Other steps involve legislative action which could and should have been requested years ago.

The single most significant advance in rural areas development came with the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1962.

It provides authority to initiate rural renewal projects, a tool which can be most effective in helping rural areas in the most serious economic trouble. We can provide technical assistance and loans to local public agencies designated by the Governor or the State legislature to develop comprehensive, far-reaching programs in rural areas which are similar in purpose and scope to the more familiar urban renewal projects.

It places the agricultural conservation program on a permanent basis, marking the turning point in land use legislation. It makes many farmers eligible for additional help under long-term agreements with USDA to change cropping systems and land use and to develop soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreational resources. Much of the land coming out of the conservation reserve will be eligible for the new land use adjustment program. The act authorizes USDA to share with local public bodies up to half the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way for small watershed projects to be dedicated to public recreation.

Earlier this week we announced the first pilot program to develop the most effective techniques for converting land on which crops are now grown to other uses—grazing, timber, recreation and others. This is in line with our philosophy that the land resources of rural America should be used and not lay idle.

It gives new authority for FHA loans for outdoor recreational enterprises at a time when the Department was getting thousands of inquiries about such enterprises. The large number of requests for information about the opportunities for family farms and groups of farmers under this program reflect a high degree of interest—and it encourages us greatly.

The Congress also took other actions this year which will benefit the rural development program. It appropriated increased funds for credit through FHA and REA, and it also increased funds for research on new uses and new processes for farm commodities.

Through the Manpower Development and Training Act, persons living in rural areas can obtain assistance in learning new skills which can open doors to new opportunities for employment either in their home community or other areas.

The urgent task is to inform the people. The recent series of land and people conferences which some of you may have attended was an important first step but more needs to be done. We need to take vigorous action to awaken local interest in rural areas development, to help rural residents organize local programs, and then help them draw on the technical competence and rural credit facilities of the Department of Agriculture. The measure of our success will be determined by the response of people in the local community.

Too many people do not yet know of the going programs—people who stand to benefit most from supervised farm credit, from low-cost loans for rural homes, and from pooling their resources in cooperatives or community development corporations.

There are examples of rural growth today where local initiative, combined with financial and technical assistance from the Department, has produced new jobs and new opportunities.

Sanders County, Mont., is such an example. For years, many farmers there had been hard pressed to make a living from dairying, hay, and grain. The soil conservation district supervisors wondered why woodlots on these farms couldn't be managed to increase farm income.

They asked the forest ranger to make a survey. He found that the area's timber if properly managed could keep a small mill in business.

Today, Sanders County has a mill employ-

ing about 75 people, and providing supplemental income for about 200 farmers. It is operating because local leadership provided the catalyst that combined local resources with those available from the Government. The Small Business Administration supplied some of the funds to build the mill. The local electric cooperative loaned money to the plant to buy needed electrical equipment.

The new accelerated public works program already is putting additional resources into Sanders County. On Lolo and Kaniksu National Forests, new projects have been started to construct roads and trails and improve timber stands. More than 3,000 man-days of work will result from these public works projects. And these national forests will become even greater assets to the county. I'm told that the national forests last year returned nearly \$100,000 to the county's treasury—money which supports schools and roads.

To illustrate the importance of credit to development of a county, I cite Roosevelt County, N. Mex.

In 1940, only 56 percent of the county's farmers owned their farms. By 1960, the number of owners had increased to 71 percent of all farmers.

Loans from the Department's Farmers Home Administration were a major factor in this rise. FHA has loaned \$1,750,000 to 150 county families to become farmowners. FHA has also advanced \$2,500,000 to farmers in the county for operating expenses. It has aided nearly 100 rural families to build new homes and farm service buildings.

You county officials, who struggle day in and day out with local financial problems, know what this new capital has meant to the people of Roosevelt County.

And the effect goes far beyond the county. It is like a pebble dropped in a still pond. It provides additional markets that help to buoy the urban economy. This is extremely important, for we are an interdependent people—rural, suburban, and urban. Revitalization of the countryside will be speeded by a strong and vigorously growing urban economy with the means to buy the goods and services, including outdoor recreation, produced in rural areas.

A second task that we see developing is the great need for technical and financial assistance to help local groups of citizens organize and begin drawing plans for overall economic development. This work is presently being carried out through the Extension Service and the technical action panels, but we already find ourselves being swamped in some areas.

It would be of great assistance if local government bodies could provide financial and technical aid to supplement the work now being done by the technical action panels. These men are not specifically trained for development planning, and they also have normal workloads to carry in addition to these new assignments.

A third area of concern relates to the development of new industries in rural communities. Many of those people who have experience in this area recognize that the community that waits for a new industry to be located from outside the community will usually wait a long time. The hope for real progress is best realized by emphasizing the growth potential from within the local community itself.

Individually, these people cannot meet the requirements for financing, management, promotion, and other essential skills. But by pooling their funds and skills, and through assistance from State and Federal agencies, the needs of establishing modern industry can be met. Perhaps cooperative arrangements can be very useful in this regard, but we need to explore ways of creating a more effective technique for developing industrial opportunity in rural communities.

The solution to this problem will also help solve a universal problem in rural areas—that of finding job opportunities for the young people as they leave high school.

A fourth area where your advice will be most helpful relates to the creation of a domestic peace corps—a project which currently is being discussed among several departments and agencies of the Government.

We have assigned one man to a special group being formed by Attorney General Robert Kennedy to study and evaluate the proposed development of a corps of men and women who would serve in rural and urban areas of this country where social and economic conditions required immediate and massive attention.

How could a domestic peace corps contribute most effectively to correcting some of the very serious problems we know exist in rural areas? Can the drive and enthusiasm which is found in the Peace Corps abroad overcome the apathy and frustration in poverty areas where rural renewal projects are needed? Could these corpsmen help the low income white, Negro, and Indian families value the economic barriers which tie them to a life of poverty? Can they provide educational opportunities which now are lacking for many young people in rural America? Can they provide the personal and individual attention needed to help the illiterate, the physically and mentally handicapped?

I believe a domestic peace corps can be a healthy and dynamic influence in the rural areas development program, and I would welcome your ideas and thoughts on the subject.

Finally, it is clear that the scientific and technological changes in agriculture have come so swiftly—and are still at work at an unbelievable speed—that most people could no more accurately describe rural America today than they could the surface of Venus. It is at once the most outstanding example of productive success in the history of man and yet harbors more poverty than all the metropolitan centers put together. It is one of the basic elements in our ability to lead the free world and yet young people leave it for want of adequate opportunity. It is sometimes described as the last bastion of freedom and yet some organizations advocate using economic pressure to drive people out of it.

It is clear, both from cold statistics and the observable events of the past decade, that the core of the problem in rural America has two parts—low income caused by chronic overproduction, the inability of the market to absorb at a fair price what our farms can easily produce and a social problem caused by farms too small to support a family, and by the failure to develop adequate income opportunities through putting the resources of rural America to non-farm uses.

Emphasis on improving farm prices and income is essential but it is not the full answer, nor will a concentration on developing nonfarm uses of rural resources be enough to enable the Americans who live in rural areas to enjoy a standard of living equal to that of their urban cousin.

Supply management, applied as a tool and not as a doctrine, is a flexible instrument to increase production of commodities in short supply and to balance production with demand when stocks become too great.

It furthers at the same time the welfare of both the producer and the consumer. It provides for national security and our commitments to friendly nations abroad by maintaining adequate reserves for war, natural disaster and the food-for-peace program. It maintains fair prices for the consumer and fair income for the farmer.

I believe we can reach a fair level of living for the rural American if we are willing to accept new ideas and explore new ways. Tangible progress has been made in that direction. We have new tools, and many people have shown their willingness to use them. We know the resources are in rural America waiting to be put to new uses. We are at a critical time when action counts.

And I am optimistic that rural America will make the most of its new opportunities.

Cuba
**Part 8: Let's Keep the Record Straight—
A Selected Chronology of Cuba and
and Castro (November 21–December
15, 1962)**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, part 8 is now offered as a continuation of my chronology on Cuba and Castro.

The "mopping-up" operations which normally take place after a battle is over now became the order of the day after the coldest of cold wars was over. First the American quarantine was lifted, the Soviets returned the courtesy by ending their combat readiness status, our ships, reservists, Navy, Marine Corps, and Strategic Air Command returned home or ceased their operations in and around Cuban waters. Even the Cuban Government was reported to have begun demobilizing its militia units which had been called to arms the day after our quarantine was declared.

Then the glow of our uneasy peace began slowly to fade as a Cuban Government newspaper renewed the controversy by an offer to swap U.N. verification of Soviet missiles removal from Cuba for U.N. supervision of dismantling of alleged anti-Castro camps on U.S. soil which supposedly were "training camps of mercenaries, spies, saboteurs, and terrorists."

Mikoyan, the Soviet's No. 1 trouble shooter, left Cuba, returned to New York, and journeyed to the White House for what was termed an "inconclusive conference on Cuba and other cold-war issues" with President Kennedy.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk did little to relieve the renewed tension when he broadcast a warning that Americans must not draw too many conclusions about a relaxation of world tensions. Stating that easing of the Cuban crisis "gives us all some confidence for the future," he nevertheless pointed out that "there were special circumstances in Cuba which are not necessarily present

in other parts of the world." And the American public swallowed this bitter medicine reluctantly, but with resignation, because it knew Secretary Rusk spoke the truth.

We soon found controversy was going to remain our way of life when the Stevenson-Alsop-Bartlett issue was suddenly dropped in our laps. Publication in the December 8 Saturday Evening Post of a joint Alsop-Bartlett article alleging that Adlai Stevenson—whose public image had improved immensely during the U.N. discussion and debate of the Cuban-Soviet missiles buildup—had advocated a soft policy toward Moscow in National Security Council discussions created a new issue. The combined indignant denials of Stevenson, his supporters, and a carefully worded letter of confidence written by President Kennedy to Stevenson were not able to put to rest a rumor that President Kennedy himself had engineered the whole thing. Later public utterances of both Stevenson and the President not only did not clear up the muddy waters, but in the opinion of many, added a shade more mud.

And it remained for Soviet Premier Khrushchev—in his own fight for an improved public image in the U.S.S.R.—to place the whole Cuban affair in clear and cold perspective by a few well-chosen words. Pointing out that although the so-called Marxist-Leninists—Chinese Communists—called imperialism a paper tiger—that paper tiger has nuclear teeth—and therefore should not be treated lightly. Then he outlined some undeniable, but to us indigestible, truths, which it would pay us to memorize in order not to forget them:

In what way have we retreated? Socialist Cuba exists. Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The impact of her revolutionary example will grow. The Government of the United States has given a pledge not to invade Cuba. The threat of thermonuclear war has been averted. Is this a retreat?

Then, staying in character, Khrushchev continued pressing for a guarantee of noninvasion of Cuba by the United States. Ignoring completely the fact that his own guarantees to the United States regarding verification of the missiles removal were worthless, he admonished us to take care lest the Soviet confidence in the word of the United States was destroyed.

And the Red Chinese added the final note of hypocrisy in virtuously declaring that they really had no part in the whole thing because they neither introduced nuclear weapons into Cuba, nor obstructed their removal. In their denial of the charge of "adventurism" or of attempts at plunging the whole world into a thermonuclear war, however, we concede that they to a certain extent spoke the truth because their actions smacked of the typical troublemaker who says, "I'll hold your coats, and let's you and him fight."

Part 8 follows:

**PART 8—A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA
AND CASTRO**

November 21, 1962: Soviet Union ends the combat-readiness alert of its armed forces which was imposed at the beginning of the